

THE COMMUNAL RESTAURANT

A STUDY OF THE PLACE OF CIVIC RESTAURANTS IN THE LIFE OF THE COMMUNITY

PREPARED IN THE SPRING AND SUMMER OF 1943

Foreword by
SIR WYNDHAM DEEDES

PRICE—SIXPENCE

PUBLISHED BY
LONDON COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SERVICE

7 BAYLEY STREET, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1



22500454111

The Research Group of the London Council of Social Service
Standing Committee on Communal Dining was composed as
follows:—

THE COMMUNAL RESTAURANT

Chairman: Mr. E. L. Jones, General Children's Nutrition
Committee.

Secretary: Mrs. Dorothy M. Warren, London Council
of Social Service.

Assistant Secretary: Miss J. M. L. Jones, London Council of
Social Service.

Members:

Mr. C. E. Jones, London's Cooperative Guild.

Miss B. V. Dick, St. Andrew's Community

Service Committee.

Mr. Michael Hickox, Friends' Way Relief

Service.

Miss A. Lundy, Institutional Management

Association.

Miss M. E. H. Jones, Kensington Community

Service Committee.

Mr. R. G. Jones, St. Andrew's and St. Mary's

Community Service Committee.

Mrs. W. M. White, Lambeth Community

Service Committee.

Mr. D. M. Stevenson, London Council of

Social Service.

The Research Group of the London Council of Social Service Standing Committee on Communal Feeding was composed as follows:—

Chairman - Miss MARJORIE RACKSTRAW, Over Thirty Association.

Director - Mr. F. LE GROS CLARK, Children's Nutrition Council.

Secretary - Miss DOROTHY M. WARREN, London Council of Social Service.

Assistant Secretary - Miss I. M. PARRY-JONES, London Council of Social Service.

Members - Mrs. C. COOK, Women's Co-operative Guild.
Miss B. M. DUCK, St. Marylebone Communal Services Committee.
Mr. MICHAEL HACKING, Friends' War Relief Service.
Miss A. LUMBY, Institutional Management Association.
Miss M. E. MILEHAM, Kensington Communal Services Committee.
Mrs. F. SOLOMON, St. Marylebone and Kensington Communal Services Committees.
Mrs. W. M. WHITE, Lambeth Communal Kitchens Committee.
Mr. D. M. SHERWOOD, London Council of Social Service.

THE COMMUNAL RESTAURANT

A STUDY OF
THE PLACE OF CIVIC RESTAURANTS IN THE
LIFE OF THE COMMUNITY

PREPARED IN THE SPRING AND SUMMER OF 1943

FOREWORD BY
SIR WYNDHAM DEEDES

PUBLISHED BY
LONDON COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SERVICE
7 BAYLEY STREET, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

THE COMMUNAL RESTAURANT

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	3
PART I—General	5
PART II—Financial	26
„ —Analysis Statement	<i>facing</i> 36

WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	weIMOmec
Coll.	pam
No.	WA 695
	1943
	L 84c

FOREWORD

IN the summer of 1940 the London Council of Social Service began first to take an interest in communal feeding. This was a short time before the schemes of the Ministry of Food were put into force.

The question was brought to its notice originally by the Over Thirty Association, whose main concern was with the difficulties of elderly and lonely people, at a time when their security was threatened and the routine of their lives upset. The need for centres where they could find friendly reassurance seemed to be urgent not only for such people, but for many others who were suffering from war-time conditions.

The Council was persuaded that the establishment of centres, where good and cheap mid-day meals could be served and a friendly club atmosphere offered would do something to meet this need, and the provision of restaurant facilities in premises already well known locally and staffed by workers whom local families had come to trust was thought to have a special value for the purpose. It was felt, moreover, that workers who had not their own canteens might be glad to use these facilities, and this view has since been more than justified.

Such a venture was regarded not merely as being important in war time, but as an experiment in social planning which was likely to have a real value when the reconstruction of society was able to take place after the war.

When the official schemes came into effect, and with them plans for emergency feeding, the London Council of Social Service, in co-operation with the Women's Voluntary Services, was asked to act on behalf of the voluntary organisations in the London area in furthering the Ministry's policy, which had there been placed in the hands of the London County Council. Twelve local agents were appointed on behalf of the voluntary organisations to work with the agents of the London County Council and the Catering Trade so that overlapping could be avoided, and the utmost use made of the resources of the three co-operating parties.

Between November, 1940, and the beginning of 1943 some forty-six restaurants had either been set up, or had developed their work to meet war-time needs, through the agency of various voluntary bodies. In some cases these were individual clubs or settlements, and in five boroughs voluntary committees, each under the chairmanship of the Mayor, took the initiative. In addition, fifteen "shadow" centres had declared their readiness to co-operate in "Blitz" feeding, should an emergency arise.

The London Council of Social Service has been able to act as a co-ordinating agency for these restaurants and as liaison between them and the London County Council and the Ministries of Food, Labour, and Works, with all of whom a close and friendly relationship has been maintained. As a result, considerable help has been secured for the restaurants in such matters as the purchase of equipment and stores, the provision of emergency stoves, and advice on personnel and training problems.

At the end of 1942 the Standing Committee on Communal Feeding, which controls this section of the Council's work, decided that the time had come to take stock of the position which had been reached as a result of the experiment which it had fostered. A Research Group was set up with instructions to survey the financial costs, the relationship between restaurant and customer, and the social contribution made by these restaurants, and furthermore, to assess the future prospects of communal feeding along the lines which had been developed. The Research Group was fortunate enough to obtain the help of Mr. F. Le Gros Clark, of the Children's Nutrition Council, who agreed not only to serve on the Sub-Committee, but also to direct the research and to summarise the findings into a report for presentation to the Council and to other appropriate authorities.

The London Council of Social Service has adopted the report to which this is a foreword, and believes that its findings will be of value to those who are interested in this aspect of local and national planning. The Council wishes to thank Mr. F. Le Gros Clark for undertaking this piece of work and for placing his knowledge and experience at the service of the Group in the preparation of the report. It wishes also to thank Miss M. Rackstraw, the Chairman, the other members of the Research Group, and those organisers and managers of restaurants who willingly gave so much time to supplying the material and the evidence which were needed. We should like as well to record our thanks to the 1,220 diners who were kind enough to answer a number of questions set out in a diners' leaflet. The answers which they gave provided an important body of evidence and this has been incorporated into the final report.

WYNDHAM DEEDES.

*Chairman, London Council of
Social Service.*

12th August, 1943.

REPORT

Part I.—GENERAL

SINCE the autumn of 1940 the practice of opening "public canteens" has been increasingly adopted. Such canteens may be variously known as "civic" or "municipal restaurants," "community meal centres," "communal restaurants" and the like; but in official phrase they seem usually to be referred to as "British Restaurants"; and there is little doubt that this name is now familiar to most of the public that might patronise them. In London itself the phrase "British Restaurant" does not seem to be in such common use as elsewhere. For the sake of uniformity, we shall ourselves throughout this report almost invariably refer to them as civic restaurants. In the majority of cases these restaurants are controlled by the local authority in whose area they lie; a few are directed by voluntary committees or bodies responsible for their inception, though these few have necessarily to be recognised by the Ministry of Food and woven into the common texture of such establishments. By the early spring of 1943 there were some 2,000 of these public restaurants spread unevenly through the country; within the area of the London County Council there were 281, of which 46 were under the control of voluntary organisations.

A country that has 2,000 restaurants of this nature might almost look upon them as a *social institution*. Their value as a war-time expedient is admitted. But it was thought worth while to probe into the more elusive problem—whether these peculiar restaurants have any *permanent* value in our national life, whether they can be said to satisfy some real popular demand, however unexpressed that demand might be. For this purpose an inquiry was undertaken. The experience of a group of restaurants, forty-one in number, was subjected to detailed analysis. They all lie within the London area, and they are all directed by various voluntary committees. The survey was carried out in the spring of 1943.

There were three reasons for selecting these particular restaurants. In the first place, committees such as these seem often to be less embarrassed by a request for intimate data of their trading operations than are the servants of a large public authority. In the second place—and this was a matter of even greater moment—these diversified restaurants were, as we knew from our own experience, a more representative sample of those of the country as a whole than are the relatively standardized canteens controlled by a single municipality. Varied as are these latter in style and service, they fall too far into a common pattern to yield a sample that would be representative of the practices adopted in a hundred scattered boroughs, or urban districts. While then, the administrative type

of institution here studied accounts probably for not more than 5 per cent. of all public canteens in the country, it actually afforded us a better opportunity of surveying the problem *as a whole* than we should have had through any approach we might have made to a single compact authority. Finally, the London Council of Social Service, on whose behalf the enquiry was carried out, was naturally interested to analyse the experience of the restaurants with which it is particularly associated.

Civic restaurants are, by definition, catering concerns not operating for commercial profit; it does not follow that they are either more or less efficient for their purpose than the commercial establishments. We have no opinions on the matter. It may be, of course, that they acquire some subtle quality of their own, that renders them more attractive to a certain section of the public, even though that public may not be consciously interested in the finances of the undertaking. That is what we had to discover. But we will agree that these restaurants must be an economic proposition; at all events, any chain of them, controlled by a single authority, must show a favourable trading balance or they can have no conceivable future. The reason is obvious. A factory canteen or a school canteen caters for a restricted clientele; the former may be indirectly subsidised by the management, the latter subject to grant from the Board of Education, as part of the recognised educational system of the country. Neither of these two types of canteen need expect liquidation, if it somehow fails to pay its way. If a civic restaurant shows a consistent trading loss, then clearly some authority or other is providing food for an unselected and possibly an undeserving portion of the general public. We can scarcely imagine any form of society where this would be tolerated. In the second part of the present report, therefore, we discuss how far and under what conditions these civic or communal restaurants are an economic proposition.

Character of the Restaurants.

Here we are dealing with the social aspect of the civic restaurants. What is true of our sample is, we feel, true of a large proportion of the restaurants of this kind in the country; they are housed in premises temporarily loaned or adapted for the purpose. Most of these premises will ultimately revert to their original owners. Thus of forty or so restaurants, nine had originally been church halls, seven were accommodated in shops and six in private houses (some of them damaged under bombardment); the remainder were housed in club buildings, which had expanded their service to meet the needs of war, in the basement of an evacuated hospital, in a shop staff canteen and so forth. If there are to be civic restaurants after the war, these will not be the premises they occupy. It is indeed possible that the whole galaxy of 2,000 restaurants, with a few isolated exceptions, will quietly fade into thin air, leaving not

a plate rack behind. Almost certainly most premises now used for restaurants will not be long available after the war; and in any case, if municipalities are to run their own civic restaurants, they will need to design suitable premises. There is only one set of possible circumstances that will prevent an inevitable gap of some duration falling between our war-time service of civic restaurants and any future service of the kind that may be established; and that is the chance that the war will be followed by a long period of months or years when food remains relatively scarce and controlled, but building materials and labour are, by some fortunate coincidence, readily available. In that case municipalities might be tempted to seek powers enabling them to construct fresh restaurants. The possibility is somewhat remote since it implies that demobilisation had taken place long before the period of continental food relief was over and the world's food supplies assured; still the possibility does in theory exist.

About a quarter of the restaurants we have surveyed lie in a chain along the boroughs just south of the river, around Southwark and Camberwell; at least half stretch in a broad belt across the north-west from St. Marylebone to Kensington; and the remnant are dispersed through Hampstead, Holborn, Stepney and a few of the adjoining boroughs. Eleven of them began to operate between the September of 1940 and the close of that year, fifteen in 1941, and seven in 1942; the other eight had originally emerged as more restricted dining clubs either before the war or during the first year of hostilities. A few of these latter cannot be called typical instances of the civic restaurant, as it is commonly found in the country as a whole.

Amenities and Equipment.

The restaurants offer their services to the public; and before we consider how the public views them and the services they offer, we have to examine the shape in which they present themselves to the curious eyes of the average citizen. Few of the areas in which they are situated can be precisely defined; but we should say that of forty-one restaurants included in our census, twenty-nine were among streets predominantly residential though occasionally dispersed with small factories, and twelve were in areas more completely commercial in character. Access to the restaurants varies; in most cases they may be entered directly from the street, but in six instances the prospective customer has to pass through a courtyard or a garden, and occasionally he has to mount or descend a flight of stairs or use a lift.

No composite picture of these restaurants could be attempted; they have all the features associated with a service that has been subject to varied improvisation. Twenty-three out of forty-one of the dining halls impress one on entry as spacious and bright enough;

but seven are only moderately bright, and eleven are distinctly dull and confined. It by no means follows that the less favoured restaurants have made no effort to compensate with bright paint and decorations, but the majority of the better situated halls are also those that have been adorned with pictures, mural paintings, bunting and so forth. About twenty-five of them could be said to have acquired an attractive interior, and in at least five instances (there may be more) it is the custom to display fresh flowers.

There is a tendency in the world of civic restaurants to adopt, where possible, tables seating four or at most six; and one can have little doubt that this is more agreeable for the average customer. The table accommodation in our sample varied and was occasionally in a state of transition. But at least a third of the restaurants still had tables mainly for eight or more, while about a quarter had tables mainly for six or for six and eight; and in only a quarter of them did it appear to be the common practice to have tables of four or under. Thus several of them have the peculiar quality of the mess-room or refectory; and this perhaps creates a war-time atmosphere that could scarcely accord with the taste of most customers in more normal circumstances.

There is evidence that the average customer is somewhat more interested in the kitchen and the service than he would normally be in a commercial establishment. But kitchens are more of a problem to the staff, and in few cases, of course, are they thoroughly convenient for their purpose. There is nothing to be gained by an analysis of their shortcomings. Almost two-thirds of the kitchens were adequately equipped, at least; and of these perhaps seven could be recorded as very good. The remnant were poorly equipped and two or three among them were patently insufficient for the service. Equipment can, of course, be improved; space is a more difficult factor. At least seventeen of the kitchens, while often well equipped, were incommodious; in five further cases there was obvious overcrowding, with a layout that could only have been inconvenient; passages and stairways had to be used for storage and the work had to be carried on from one small room to another. Almost half the arrangements could, however, be classified as good or reasonable. On the whole the pattern of the washing-up facilities seems to follow that of the other functions of a kitchen; but in only nine instances can the sinks and water supply be said to suit in most respects the convenience of the staff.

The diner, however, is likely to be more sensitive about the manner in which the food is served than where it is prepared. In this respect the restaurants vary considerably. Several can call upon a certain amount of voluntary labour, and two at least employ a waitress service; eight serve over a hatch between the kitchen and the dining hall, and seven serve over a counter or hot plate, beyond which lies the kitchen, usually in the same hall. In the remaining restaurants the food had to be conveyed from one room to another with varying degrees of inconvenience. In some a small

flight of steps has to be negotiated; in others there is a passage between the two rooms.

Whatever problems the staff have to overcome in presenting the food before the customer, the customer himself has almost invariably to enter a queue and collect his own food from counter or hatch. It is not so much the fact of a queue that seems to impress the mind of the customer, as the relative speed of the queue; it is the subjective sense of moving steadily towards his goal that satisfies him. An estimate taken in a number of typical restaurants shows that the rate of motion during the peak period may vary widely. In the space of five minutes ten, twenty, thirty or even forty persons might pass the serving point and go with their plates to the tables. An average service of twenty in five minutes would probably be typical of many of the restaurants in our sample. The speed of service depends, of course, on several factors; but very few of the restaurants are in a position to attempt a scientific solution.

We may finally record the experience of the restaurants in the flow of custom that passes through them in the course of an average week, though we see no reason to suggest that they differ in this respect from the commercial establishments. In at least three-quarters of the cases both Monday and Saturday are slack days, Saturday sometimes showing a demand only half that of the mid-week. In no less than thirty-four of the restaurants is Saturday a poor day for business. The slackness of Monday is due no doubt to the use made by the public of the week-end joint for the provision of a cut lunch. Early closing day has some effect on a few of the restaurants; at least six of the supervisors note a decreased custom on that day. Nine instances, however, show there is a fairly even flow through the whole week, and certainly the three mid-week days are almost invariably brisk.

The Customers.

It is unlikely that the average diner will be familiar with more than one or two of these forty or so civic restaurants, and his opinion of them will necessarily be affected by the few he chances to visit. But if we take a sample of custom dispersed over the forty-one restaurants, we may penetrate into the public mind and discover how it reacts to this novel institution.

As we have said, it appears to us that our sample is not unrepresentative of the 2,000 civic restaurants already in operation throughout the country in the spring of 1943. Between them these restaurants were catering for an average mid-day clientele of almost 600,000 diners. Our own forty-one restaurants were dealing with an average daily figure of about 12,350. But such restaurants as these are far from uniform in capacity, and one could find parallels elsewhere in the country both for those who normally cater for 100-200 customers and those who operate at a level of 600-700 or over. Of the adult customers, 1,220 were induced to answer a

series of questions, that is approximately 10 per cent. of the clientele. It is upon their replies that we shall base some of our conclusions. The opinions of the relatively small number of children that still attended the restaurants we made no effort to secure; they are a dwindling section of the normal clientele.

To obtain the replies, we arranged for a printed notice to be prominently displayed for a week in each restaurant, explaining that it was at this stage necessary to ascertain how far such restaurants had a permanent value and requesting the aid of the public in coming to a decision. At the close of that period customers were beginning to clamour for the question forms; the forms were then distributed by the managers, more or less proportionately to the numbers using each restaurant. It may be said that a week would give time to the diners to discuss and formalise their opinions; for an unconsidered opinion was of no value to us, as it was precisely the *social trends* of opinion that we wished to secure.

It may be argued that selective influences must have been at work in determining which of the diners would form our sample of 1,220; it would be the regular customers, those on familiar terms with the staff. We were aware of this, but we doubted the value of opinions expressed by rare visitants to the restaurant. It is a curious fact that the majority of the diners *are* regular customers. Before the form of questions was issued, the staffs of all the restaurants were asked to compute the daily number of their customers who could be termed regular, in the sense that they turned up day after day and week after week. The average figure was approximately 85 per cent. Eleven managers stated that they had 70-75 per cent. of regular customers, and twenty-three estimated that the number was as high as 90 per cent. Admittedly such a computation is inexact, but we were surprised at the degree to which it corresponded with the information we secured from the diners themselves.

The statement of any one of the diners may be accepted with caution, but collectively their broad meaning is clear. In brief, some 910 out of the 1,220 (75 per cent.) said that they were daily customers; 180 (15 per cent.) implied that they were rather less regular, perhaps visiting the restaurant three or four days in the week; a further fifty (4 per cent.) showed a still less regular attendance, though it seemed clear that they made considerable use of the service. The remainder were either occasional visitants or dropped in when they found themselves in that neighbourhood. As we anticipated, the great majority of those who replied were in some sense habitués of the restaurants. Many asserted that they had been so for a long period.

We may give it as our impression that most restaurants of this kind attract a definite type of custom, and that this custom, whatever be the selective factors at work in deciding its composition, remains very loyal to the restaurant of its choice. It tends to adopt the restaurant as its own. We are not suggesting that many

small commercial establishments have any less of a magnetic influence on a certain type of customer. We merely record the fact that thirty out of forty managers interviewed stated that there had been relatively little change among the clientele since the early days. The type, at all events, had remained stable. In the cases where a change had occurred, it was often due to a local removal of office workers in the course of the war or to the gradual increase in custom from a single depot or block of offices.

The opening of a civic restaurant in most cases begins immediately to attract its own peculiar type of custom. This seems to be a common experience throughout the country. Among our own sample, there were several that had doubled, trebled or even quadrupled their number of diners in the course of the first week of operation. Some appear to have been serving in the fourth week after opening about twice or three times the number of meals they had served in the first week. It may, however, have been a matter of months before the restaurant finally stabilised upon its peak of custom; and this was due no doubt to the fact that it takes time for both staff and diners to accommodate themselves to the requirements of a hatch or hot-plate type of service. It is, incidentally, of interest that only eighteen of the restaurants seem to have sought any early publicity, either in the form of a civic opening or through articles in the local press. Such publicity appears to have made little difference in the subsequent experience of the restaurant. Less than half of them, again, indulge in external notices to attract the public; many of the staffs are satisfied with the regular clientele they have already established, and the restaurants begin to assume, in consequence, the character of an intimate club. There is, of course, no restriction; but fresh custom tends to arrive, as it were, "by introduction."

Age and Sex of the Clientele.

Who, then, are the permanent habitués of this type of restaurant? Do they represent a special section of the public? Habit, of course, leads a man to frequent a dining place to which he has grown accustomed and where he imagines, whether rightly or wrongly, that he is recognised by the staff as "one of their regulars." It will persuade him even to endure some discomfort; and it is probable that many casual visitants are intimidated by the sight of a queue that has become familiar to the man who follows it four or five days in a week. We believe that any civic restaurant of this kind rapidly acquires its own clientele and moulds it to its own pattern. The potential demand is by no means saturated, and it is perhaps not so much that the restaurants attract a special type of diner, as that a special type of diner is in process of being created through the existence of the restaurants.

In the following table we show the ages, sexes and status (married or unmarried) of all the 1,220 customers who form our sample. The term "unmarried" here includes widows and widowers.

TABLE I. SEX AND AGE COMPOSITION OF 1,220 CUSTOMERS.

Age Group	Male		Female		Totals		Total
	M.	U.	M.	U.	Male	Female	
15-25 ...	4	63	26	78	67	104	171
26-40 ...	127	47	135	101	174	236	410
41-59 ...	257	57	62	83	314	145	459
60+ ...	39	62	15	64	101	79	180
TOTALS ...	427	229	238	326	656	564	1,220

M. = Married. U. = Unmarried.

Let us briefly examine these figures. The customers are drawn from the population of Greater London, aged fifteen and upwards. Now, we have a fair idea from statistical returns what proportion of the population of this area falls within the various age groups, and we can thus venture some comparison. In normal times the young men of 15-25 represent 22 per cent. of the "adult" male population. But we should not expect the proportion of customers of that age to be anywhere near as high; the armed forces have absorbed a large number of them, and in any case relatively few young male workers frequent eating establishments. We are not therefore surprised that only 10 per cent. of our male customers fall within the youngest age group. Even at the ages 26-40 the armed forces have had their effect on the male population; the proportion of adult males in London within this age group is 32 per cent.; in our sample it is 27 per cent. The natural result of this is that the customers between forty-one and sixty years form a far higher proportion of the clientele than the actual proportion of men of this age in the London area—48 per cent. as compared with 31 per cent. Finally, the proportion of elderly men of sixty and over in our sample is precisely the same as their proportion among the adult males in the population—15 per cent.

When we come to the women, we find them, as a whole, far more representative of the female population of various ages in the London area. We notice that in our sample there is a high proportion of married women, of whom (let us remark) by far the greater number are now employed. Doubtless this, too, reflects the war-time trend; in years of peace the age percentages might be very different. But, as it is, the proportion of "adult" females of 15-25 in the total adult female population is 20 per cent.; and that in our sample is 18 per cent. However, a larger proportion

of the females in the 26-40 age group frequent the restaurants than the proportion among those of a more mature age; and this might have been expected, since it is in the younger ages that the married women are absorbed into employment. There are in our sample 135 married women between 25 and 40 and only 62 between 41 and 60. The actual figures show that in Greater London the proportion of adult females between 26 and 40 is 31 per cent., that in our sample of customers is 42 per cent. The proportions in the age group 41-60 are 32 per cent. and 26 per cent. respectively. So with the elderly females of the population. There are only 14 per cent. of them represented in our sample of female customers, whereas in the adult female population of London there are 17 per cent.

Thus, it can be maintained that the diners in our restaurants form as a whole a fairly representative section of the public in respect of their age structure. It is what we might have expected. Quite as natural is the fact that in our sample there is a far higher proportion of unmarried women than there is in the total population. We may even conclude that the relatively high proportion of elderly persons among the diners makes these restaurants more representative of the population of the metropolis than would be any comparable group of commercial establishments.

Occupation of the Clientele.

It is further necessary to comment on the occupations of those who frequent the restaurants. The categories have been made broadly inclusive. That for industrial workers embraces such as might be employed at a railway terminus or in a bus depot, and a category for "mobile workers" (*i.e.* transport, messengers, &c.) has been added because such workers as these might be only occasionally in the neighbourhood of the restaurant.

TABLE II. COMPOSITION OF 1,220 CUSTOMERS BY OCCUPATION.

Occupation	Number	Approx. %
Professional and Managerial	174	14
Office Workers	323	26
Commercial and Shop Workers	110	9
Industrial and Rail Workers	337	28
Mobile Workers (Transport, Messengers, &c.)	74	6
H.M. Forces, Civilian Defence Workers, &c.	29	2
Housewives	67	6
Elderly Persons (Pensioners, &c.)	91	8
No Occupation	15	1
TOTALS	1,220	100

It is impossible to attempt any detailed comparison of these figures with those of occupied groups in the London area, since there are no adequate returns available of which we could make use. The proportion of housewives in our sample is clearly far lower than it is for the total population of the area; but that is what we should have anticipated. Most of the customers are engaged in some occupation, and we have no idea from how wide an area they are drawn; many of them may reside outside the metropolis. According to the 1931 census, the skilled and semi-skilled workers together formed at that time about 65 per cent. of the occupied population of the County of London. Our industrial, commercial and mobile groups taken together form 43 per cent. of our sample of customers. But we must allow that many such workers are now taking their meals in industrial canteens, and we may assume that some we have called office workers would have been included by the census under these categories. Possibly this proportion of occupied persons is thus fairly well represented.

On the other hand, the census gives the proportion of unskilled workers in London as 21 per cent.; and we incline to think that this class may be definitely under-represented in our sample, though we did not specifically allow for it in our categories. The census returns show that the proportion of professional and clerical workers resident in Middlesex is far higher than it is in the County of London—19 per cent. as compared with 13 per cent. Since many of our customers in these two classes may travel some distance to their work, they are likely to represent the higher of the two percentages; but even then they are represented in our sample to the proportion of 40 per cent. of all the diners. Assuming that a number of industrial workers are catered for in their own factories or depots, we should suppose that office workers would show a larger proportion of the customers than their share in the occupied population would justify. Yet allowing for that, and allowing too for the greater readiness of the office worker to undertake the filling up of a questionnaire, it still seems probable that the civic restaurant attracts custom to a disproportionate extent from the black-coated employee. A surprising thing, it may be noted, is the relatively small percentage of shop assistants who appear to use the service.

The fact that some of the larger restaurants are situated in areas of office premises accounts, of course, for this trend in our figures. But it may be remarked that in some of the restaurants a gradual but unmistakeable invasion of office workers has been observed. A single spy from a large block of offices will soon begin to infect a whole battalion of his colleagues with the civic restaurant habit. To what extent has this tended to exclude other types of workers? Not much perhaps in the case of the skilled artisan, but it is our opinion, from other evidence, that in some instances the unskilled and rough-handed worker may have been intimidated by the sight of a queue of predominantly white-collared diners.

The Housewife as a Customer.

There are two occupational categories that require special comment, the housewives and the elderly persons. Six per cent. of the diners were housewives; and while this is evidently the case for various of the civic restaurants in the country as a whole, we are inclined to think that it would not be true for a large proportion of them. The total percentage of housewives who frequent the restaurants of the country is probably much lower. In only seven of our forty restaurants did the manager agree that there were a fair number of housewives, usually with young children. Of the remainder, four believed that they had no housewife custom at all; and in all the others there were very few housewives to be found, though in twenty-one of them an occasional mother would be accompanied by her child. It is, of course, possible that the housewives would be more hesitant in volunteering answers to a series of questions, but the testimony of the managers agrees with our own findings. In our sample of diners at least half the housewives were concentrated in four or five restaurants. Even if all the 281 civic canteens in London had between them a 6 per cent. custom from housewives, only 3,000-4,000 London housewives would be daily dining in this fashion, a minute proportion of so great a section of the public.

The "cash-and-carry" service of cooked meals would presumably be patronised in the main by housewives; but in the aggregate this is not a large feature of the restaurant service. It amounts to less than 6 per cent. of the daily custom in the dining halls, and it has not been included in our estimate of 12,350 dinners served. Only ten of the restaurants had a significant "cash-and-carry" service, while ten apparently had little or none. Whether or no the civic restaurant has a future among the housewives of the country, it has still to make an appreciable start in this direction; and beyond that we have no wish here to comment. The whole subject of "home cooking" has acquired a vaguely *moral* flavour, which may tend in itself to prevent the married women from moulding their own social customs according to their own changing needs.

It has occasionally been said that an increase in the restaurant service arises from a desire to supplement rationed foods, particularly meat; and this may be a convenient place to discuss the matter. Most of the diners obviously have a "legitimate" claim on the service, since they come from their places of work. But what of those who leave their homes for the purpose? It is significant that only fifty-two of the customers stated in their replies that they felt the domestic ration to be insufficient, though, of course, a number of others might less naively have suppressed this motive. But of the fifty-two a considerable proportion were housewives. The evidence of the managers shows that thirteen out of twenty-three of them believe that this motive exists in some measure

among their clientele; five of them can point to some increase in the "cash-and-carry" service, however slight; and four indicated that the motive was especially obvious among the housewives. But the majority of the twenty-three had but meagre grounds for their belief, and we cannot accept their evidence as conclusive. There is, however, a substantial interest among the diners in the meat dish. Most of the managers asserted that an attractive meat dish was the surest draw, and at least half of those who remarked on the subject agreed that a joint was the dish that most interested their customers. We imagine that this is a universal experience. There is little question that for the workers of Britain sufficiency of meat is the criterion of a satisfactory diet.

The Aged Person as a Customer.

The other category of diners that requires comment is the old persons. In our sample there were 180 men and women over the age of sixty, of whom about ninety were on Old Age Pension. It is a characteristic of our restaurants that a large number of them have agreed to give special treatment to the old age pensioner. In twenty-one instances the pensioner has his meal at a low price; usually this price is half that paid by the normal customer; in one case only is the balance credited to the restaurant from a local charity. Several of the restaurants allot a special table or a special time to the pensioners. As in the case of housewives, the pensioners seem to be concentrated in large degree among a relatively small number of the restaurants; half of our sample of ninety are in five of the restaurants only. But the system of providing them with a meal at half the normal price is gradually spreading, and the sense of the elderly people of the value to them of this concession is fully reflected in the nature of their replies.

The subject deserves more ample treatment. Many of these aged persons live alone in single rooms, where at the best of times they frequently neglect their dietetic welfare. It is manifest that their mid-day visit to the restaurant is a social occasion, and that, where they have a table allotted to them, they sit long in cheerful conversation with their neighbours. A medical survey of a group of seventy-year-old men and women who had dined regularly in one of these restaurants might repay the effort, particularly if they were compared with a group that had not had the benefit of a daily hot meal served by a considerate staff. It may perhaps be argued that, instead of adjusting the pensioner's meal ticket to his income, the community should adjust his income to the normal price of a daily meal; we prefer here merely to note the paradox and leave others to decide the issue.

Previous Dining Habits of the Customers.

How, then, did these 1,220 customers obtain their mid-day meals before they found their way to these civic restaurants?

Their replies seem fairly explicit. From seventy-two we had no clear indication. But of the remaining 1,148 there were 272 (24 per cent.) who used formerly to dine at home. This, however, is deceptive. Probably half of them, or more, have been drawn into industry or commerce for the first time; others explain that their wives are now on war work. A good proportion of the remnant is, of course, composed of housewives and pensioners. Ninety-one diners (8 per cent.) had formerly taken their meal in a works or office canteen and had, in some instances, considered the civic restaurant more to their taste. Perhaps this is a regrettably high percentage, though it is recognised that this trend does exist; but in a number of the cases the canteen they had once frequented was now closed down through removal of many of the staff, or had been damaged through enemy action. A small group, nine in all (1 per cent.) had transferred their custom from some other civic restaurant.

The proportion that had previously taken a sandwich lunch was 314 (27 per cent.), and of these not a few express their satisfaction at the change of habit. The remainder had frequented private catering establishments; of these, as far as we could distinguish, 239 (21 per cent.) had dined at private restaurants, 203 (18 per cent.) in workers' cafés and snack-bars, and twenty (1 per cent.) in public houses. We have, of course, not attached precise percentages to these figures; that would only be misleading. The issue is clear. In the country as a whole the number of workers who would, but for the civic restaurants, have been carrying sandwiches for their lunch must be far higher than our proportion of little over a quarter of the sample. London streets are relatively well provided with cafés. In the country as a whole probably 200,000 men and women have been saved from the monotony of the carried lunch by the emergence of the civic restaurant service. But some 40 per cent of our sample used once to dine in the commercial establishments; and we must consider briefly what this means.

Of our diners, 27 per cent. used to carry a sandwich lunch. There is no reason to suppose that they are unique in their change of habits; and, if that be so, the demand on the available café and snack-bar accommodation may have risen in the same measure. In other words, we may assume that the rationing of meat and cheese has made *all* lunch-rooms more crowded than they were.

Certainly that is the impression of the average diner; and to this are added the restriction of the labour market and the fact that many small cafés cannot be readily adapted for a hatch or *cafeteria* service. In conclusion, there is evidence that the actual number of commercial establishments of this nature has diminished in the course of the war. This is not the place for a detailed analysis of figures, but if we take three of the boroughs (Kensington, Paddington and St. Marylebone) in which our civic restaurants are especially concentrated we find it on record that since the January of 1940 the net number of commercial catering establishments has

fallen by about 9 per cent. If this represents in any degree the curtailment of available accommodation in the London area, it is obvious that the civic restaurants are doing no more as yet than filling the inevitable gap.

Consumer Opinion.

What, then, are the motives that lead people to use the civic restaurant and to continue to use it? There is probably, as we saw, a social influence at work, selecting those who, after an experiment, become very regular customers. Most of the diners gave several reasons, and some expounded at length the advantages of the service. The motives can thus be classified, though, of course, the numbers attached to each do not exclude one another. A few trends in social opinion may thus be distinguished. Several of the motives are of a practical nature. Three hundred and seven of the diners (25 per cent.) say that it is near their work or (less often) near their home; or else use the more vague definition of "convenient"; 355 (28 per cent.) mention the speed of service, and plainly to those who have accustomed themselves to it the serving table method is preferred in many instances to the waitress service of a crowded restaurant. As we have already mentioned, there were fifty-two who felt that it saved their rations, and to these we may add nineteen who remarked that it saved fuel. There were a few scattered replies that suggested other motives: nine stated they had no canteen at their work and fourteen (mainly women) implied that it gave them time for shopping.

But most of the replies refer rather to the *quality* of the restaurant itself. The relative cheapness of the meal is, of course, a practical consideration, but it is frequently expressed in such phrases as "value for money," which seems to refer to the food served. The element of cheapness is mentioned by 681 (55 per cent.). That the food itself is appreciated there can be no doubt; 669 of the customers (a similar percentage) seem specifically to commend the fare. Those who look beyond their plate of food to the atmosphere of the place represent a smaller but a significant proportion, and it is one dispersed generally among the restaurants; 400 (33 per cent.) speak of the good service, implying (it would seem) that it is neat, smooth and agreeable to them; 150 (12 per cent.) comment on the courtesy or civility (a phrase in common use) that they experience, and it is noticeable that this sense is fairly general among the more elderly customers. Cleanliness clearly affects the minds of many of these diners; it is mentioned, though usually in rather unprecise terms, by 235 (18 per cent.). Again there is a dispersed group of about 120, who are sensible of an atmosphere they term "comfortable," "pleasant" or, in forty-one instances, "homely." It is true that such opinions as these are not expressed in all the restaurants, but they are by no means concentrated in two or three.

Opinions about the restaurants are naturally influenced by the courtesy of the diners themselves. But they suggest that the civic restaurant has something to offer a certain type of customer, which can be expressed in the phrase "you know what you are getting." The food is felt to be reliable and fresh and to be cleanly prepared, and there is some intangible approximation to the "home" atmosphere. Those who know the average British citizen will be aware how profoundly he is affected by these qualities and how deep lies his suspicion of food prepared for him under conditions over which he has no control. Many public houses that provide dinners trade on this prejudice both in the type of food served and in their style of service; and in an extended way our restaurants perhaps resemble the atmosphere of some public house dining rooms without the benefit of the licence. It may be noted that only 1 per cent. of the replies were from persons who formerly went to a public house for their dinners; but we have no figures for the number of meals served daily in such establishments.

It is further of interest that about a quarter of the replies, in stating motives, either refer to the advantage the civic restaurant possesses, in one way or another, over the commercial establishment, or else use a comparative term such as "cleaner," "pleasanter." Doubtless their experience of the private caterer varied; doubtless, too, they have been affected by the crowded condition of many war-time cafés. But there is moving among them a fluid sense of some value implicit in the civic restaurant service. Such references are few, but are worth recording. Twenty-six speak of the fact that the restaurants are run without a profit motive, seven mention with approval that there is no tipping, and a further seven the fact that there is no "class distinction" or that there is no "favouritism." Forty-four welcome the civic restaurant for its opportunity of new social contacts. Admittedly we shall have to go much further before these considerations are prominent, if they ever are, in the minds of the public. But the ferment is at work, and the mixture of occupations and classes is slowly fashioning a social opinion.

It is not, however, felt by the staffs of the various restaurants that their customers show much lively interest in the running of the concern. In seventeen out of thirty-three restaurants the interest shown appeared to be very slight or non-existent. But in sixteen the diners had been known to discuss the matter with the staff. Some had assumed that the restaurant was run by the government or by a local authority; some had appreciated that there was no profit motive involved; and in one or two the customers had adopted a vague air of possessiveness in regard to the place. Yet, with few exceptions, the restaurants have not acquired more than a faint resemblance to the atmosphere of a club. The restaurants vary; some are frequented by diners in a hurry, others have a more leisured style about them.

The Customer and the Staff.

The fusion of a mass of regular diners, many of whom are beginning to recognise one another as acquaintances, and a staff of a peculiar kind is, however, giving these places their own character. Is this character unique? There is no question that a relationship of social co-operation has been often established between staff and diners. It is the habit of the "regular" in any establishment to prefer his own table, to come and go with his cronies and to exchange pleasantries with the staff. But here we have at least a quarter of the managers agreeing that customers will occasionally volunteer to carry dishes from the kitchen, to help with the washing-up, to clear tables and to inspect the kitchen with some interest. Gifts of flowers and of vegetables or other food are not infrequently brought. In two of the restaurants customers organised letters of appreciation and obtained 200-300 signatures, and in others it was felt suitable that a collection should be formally arranged at Christmas, that the staff might have a sense that their services were valued. Constructive criticism, however, is not common, and to most of the diners the place is merely a convenient source of reliable food.

Some of the serving staffs are wholly or partly voluntary, though for the most part they are paid. Most are composed of women of mature age, though occasionally they are young. But whether they are working-class married women or distinctively middle class, they usually have an unprofessional air and adopt an agreeably casual attitude towards the business in hand. With this they combine, as the customers evidently recognise, a considerable measure of quiet efficiency. The effect is unconventional, and the patent degree of improvisation, both in the dining hall and in the staff, does perhaps convey a sense that this is all a war-time expedient with something of the "mess room" about it. It is clear that most of the managers and many of the serving staffs are on intimate personal terms with a large number of their customers.

There has, however, been no systematic effort on the part of managers to influence the food habits of diners. More than a quarter admitted that they had made no attempt to do so. At the other extreme there were three who had organised demonstrations; four had occasionally distributed a few pamphlets; and five had displayed posters. Intermediate lay a group of about thirteen who maintained that the serving of novel dishes was the best method of creating the taste for them; and there is much to be said for this. Among them all were perhaps fifteen who had at times discussed food values with some of their customers.

It would not be easy to say how far the tastes of the clientele are actually undergoing a change. More than half of the managers were impressed by their conservatism, though the extent of this seems to depend partly on the type of custom. Briefly it appears

that many of the restaurants do not serve vegetables in salad form except in summer, but at least eighteen of the managers report a growing inclination to take salads or cooked vegetables. It is said that in some restaurants at least 30 per cent. of diners can be expected to choose salads. Cheese dishes do not seem as yet to have attained a high measure of popularity, though in some cases there is a growing demand; the proportion taking a cheese dish in several of the restaurants would not be more than 20 per cent. Of course the habitués take, on the whole, what comes, and these restaurants are places of habitual custom. It is the 10-20 per cent. of chance customers who on an average day study the menu board with a speculative eye and retire to try their luck elsewhere, if there is no meat dish on the bill of fare. So much is this the case that there is an increasing tendency in these restaurants, especially those that normally have a 20 per cent. or so casual custom, to remove the menu board from the outside. Few customers, they say, leave the place once they are in the queue. It has now reached the stage where at least half the restaurants have removed the bill of fare from the entrance, and most of those who still retain it state that they notice a distinct fall in custom on the meatless days.

The Customer and the Future of the Restaurant.

In so far as the restaurants have in them a quality of impermanence, it is impossible for most people to stretch their imagination to the post-war future of such a service. In their present form they are patently such stuff as wars are made of; they are, as we have said, like refectories; they remind us that we are all camping on the edge of bombardment. There may, after the war, be catering enterprises run not for profit by local authorities and voluntary bodies; if so, they will have to be in other premises and with other staff.

When diners were asked if they wished such a service to continue after the war, the overwhelming majority said "yes." One in seven was emphatic in his reply. In our opinion this does indicate that the public, that has adapted itself to these restaurants, finds that they meet its demands. When asked if they would like to have further civic restaurants opened either near their home or near their place of work, the diners again mostly replied in the affirmative, apparently without giving the matter much thought. But here 2 per cent. said "no," and about 4 per cent. remarked that they felt that the district was already well served. Of those who wished for further restaurants to be opened, 7 per cent. specifically mentioned that they would like them nearer to their place of work.

What the restaurant management thinks about it, is of some importance, in that a subtle impression may be conveyed to the customers. Twenty-six of the managers gave us their opinion, and

of these eighteen felt that the restaurants were essential for industrial workers, for mobile workers, such as lorry drivers, or for old age pensioners. There was, however, a vague fear expressed by some that the habit of canteen feeding might lead to a loosening of family ties. Four of the managers looked upon them as a war-time measure only, but eleven appreciated that, if they continued after the war, the staff would have to be carefully selected in order to maintain the atmosphere, and that both in premises and in menus they would have to compete with the commercial caterer.

It is improbable that future conditions have been visualised clearly either by management or by diners. Since the customers were almost unanimous in their desire that the service should continue, there were very few who replied to a request that they should give sound reasons against continuance. Some thought that the civic restaurants were not justified in normal times and in any case could not compete; two or three were conscious of the complaints of the private caterers, and four or five feared that the habit might weaken home ties.

An effort was finally made to get the customers to envisage the kind of improvements they would like to see introduced for their greater comfort or convenience. It was not very successful. Not more than a quarter could venture a reply, and it was noticeable that in many of the restaurants the replies come predominantly from the black-coated type of worker. It may be that such a scope of imaginative thought, as this demands, can only be achieved through personal interviews; or it may be that the failure to respond reflects a civilisation that has left us unwilling to dream of future reforms. The citizen of this country is still too commonly cynical about the prospect of his "brave new world." The larger proportion of the suggestions (143) referred merely to a desire for more variety in the menu, and of these there were twenty-six who wanted more meat; a few spoke of the need for more fish or sugar. Sixteen wished for the food to be kept hotter. However, a fair number spoke also of the dining hall and its equipment. These places are frequently cramped and inconvenient. It is not surprising that ninety-three of the diners expressed a desire that there should be more space between the tables, and 102, probably implying much the same sense, spoke of the need for more accommodation. The urge for more spacious premises is doubtless also apparent in the desire in thirty-one cases for smaller tables, in thirty-three cases for speedier or better service, and in thirteen cases for priority to be given to workers. The queue principle is, of course, almost an inevitable feature of such restaurants, but it is capable of great refinement, and one is surprised that so few of the customers referred to it. Twenty-seven of them mentioned the need to avoid outside queues, or at least to provide cover, and in other ways proposed improvements; a further ten inquired whether weekly tickets could not be supplied to regular customers, to enable

them to by-pass the queue. Impracticable as this suggestion may be, it shows a trend in social consciousness that is worth noting.

The amenities of the place were remarked on by several. Twenty-six expressed a wish for better premises, but only sixteen conceived of a separate rest room or coffee room attached. This is curious because a few of the restaurants do, in fact, possess a separate room of some kind where the diner may take his tea or coffee after the meal. Such a room helps to speed up the service, and it does impart a faint flavour of club life to the restaurant. It should certainly form part of the ideal civic restaurant. But there was one type of amenity which attracted some attention: forty-eight of the diners desired that children should be segregated, usually in another room. This is a proposal worthy of attention.

It is now becoming the habit in most civic restaurants of this type to discourage school children; many schools have, of course, their own canteens. But the presence of even a few children of school age and of younger children accompanied by their mothers can be a disturbing factor in a meal, and even two years back there were managers who recognised the faint wave of irritation that might pass over a hall of adult diners. It is fair neither on the factory or office worker, who wants his meal in peace, nor on the mothers themselves. More than one observer has recommended that, if local housewives with children are to have a chance of using the service, they should have a special room allotted to them; and in any design for future restaurants this should be considered.

If we assume that, as a whole, the opinions of the diners reveal a fluid trend in social consciousness, then it is clear that they rarely comment on the staff. What they are demanding is more space for movement, smaller tables, chairs in place of benches, and a refinement of the queueing system. They are sensible of the shortness of the lunch hour, and this, with the desire that it shall be as leisured as possible, influences their opinions, even in the occasional suggestion that a clock ought to be provided in the restaurant. We may suppose that the type of staff usually found in these restaurants suits the type of customer who frequents them. This is further implied in the amicable relations that have been established between them.

Conclusions.

Can we distinguish in the civic restaurant any quality of permanence? Does it meet a normal demand? Only a small minority of the public displays curiosity as to its economic basis; a still smaller minority shows any inclination to assume the citizen's responsibility for its welfare. This may partly be due to the fact that there has been no campaign of public enlightenment. Many of the local authorities and many even of the managers seem quite unconvinced that the restaurants are or should be more than a

war-time expedient. But the restaurants have their public and are, as we said, creating a stable public. It is impossible to estimate how large their potential public might be.

Their unique quality is threefold in substance. They are essentially democratic in price and in clientele; the fusion of class types is very evident in many of them. They provide reliable and homely fare, obviously selected by persons who have an eye to the dietetic interests of their customers; and this, as we have remarked, is a matter the importance of which to the British consumer is often under-estimated. Finally, both staff and management succeed in combining the air of the responsible public servant with a demeanour that is at once homely and unconventional. They are so patently making the best of bad conditions; and they are, in most instances, so patently domesticated women preparing food for an incredibly enlarged family.

If these qualities can be preserved, then the civic restaurant has, in our opinion, a future before it. That premises will have to be built for the purpose, we have already agreed. The science of the cafeteria service will have to be developed. Moreover, the canteens of the post-war epoch will have to compete in choice and variety of dishes. But in some measure they can be subtly used for the education of the public in food values. As in any stable clientele, individuals may always be found who will co-operate both in this and in assuming responsibility for the well-being of the concern. If they are good mixers, they can impart to it a club atmosphere; but unless the restaurant opens in the evenings, the lunch-time interval is usually too brief to permit this to develop far, though the addition of a tea and coffee room with a few journals and easy chairs may often give an intimate flavour to the whole place.

We have so far assumed that the emergence in the country of more than 2,000 restaurants of this character has been justified by war-time requirements. The question is not entirely relevant yet it is worthy of some brief consideration. It is doubtful whether the Ministry of Food conceived that there would be much saving of food, fuel or labour through the service; and indeed it is difficult to see how this could be achieved, until a far higher percentage of the population relies for its main meals upon restaurants or canteens. The civic restaurant first emerged as an institution in the season of aerial bombardment; and the "communal feeding centres" were at that time closely related to the emergency centres for the relief of the homeless. They were related in the sense that they were conceived as kitchens in running order that might, for that reason, assist to cushion the shock of an unprecedented assault. It was evident that any of them could in an emergency treble or quadruple its daily service of meals.

As time went on they began to acquire a new social significance, though their original object has never been forgotten. They provide the Ministry with a reserve of some value; it is clear, for example,

that in periods of scarcity they could be used entirely for the feeding of a large proportion of those school children who have still no place in the school canteens. But they have now become the daily resort of a considerable number of citizens; and, as such, they have been fused into our normal way of life and will presumably serve us well through those arduous days that may be the immediate aftermath of war.

It has been our task to examine in what measure the civic restaurant might have a social value that is even more permanent. Cautiously we would suggest that it has, and that we are here witnessing, even under the tempest of war, the emergence of a new social form. We are in no sense utopians, yet we cannot refrain from a surmise that our sixteenth-century forefathers were wise beyond their generation. "The citizens have," said Sir Thomas More in his vision of an ideal community, "certain houses appointed and prepared for them. To these halls, at the set hours of dinner and supper, cometh all the whole ward except such as be sick in hospitals or else in their own homes. For though no man be prohibited to dine at home, yet no man doth it willingly because it is counted a point of small honesty. And also it is a folly to take the pain to dress a bad dinner at home when they might be welcome to good and fine fare so nigh at hand at the hall."

Part II.—FINANCIAL

The Financial Side.

AS has already been stated, the primary object of the investigation that has been carried out was to obtain some picture of the place that civic restaurants might fill after the war. Apart from all other considerations, one of the main factors, determining whether they will continue or not, would seem to be that of finance. This would apply whether restaurants were run by a local authority or by a voluntary association; for if any restaurant that is available to the public generally cannot be financially self-supporting, then it would seem it must be only a matter of time before it closes. Of course, in certain cases a local authority might make a grant or else voluntary funds might be raised for the purpose of running a restaurant to cater for such specific classes of people as invalids or old age pensioners; but there could be little justification for subsidising, in any way, a service which, of necessity, must be limited in scope and yet which at the same time might be used by members of the public generally.

The main criterion, therefore, by which the future of civic restaurants must be judged is finance, and for this reason the forty-one restaurants concerned in our enquiry were asked to submit detailed and comprehensive financial returns. Thirty-five of the restaurants were able to take part in the financial enquiry. Of the remaining six, three restaurants had not the staff available to work out the information required; one had only recently opened and no accounts were available; one was run in connection with a club and separate figures for the restaurant could not be obtained; and one was part of a canteen training centre so that any figures supplied would be misleading as far as this enquiry was concerned.

After examining the returns of the thirty-five restaurants, it was decided to leave out a further five for the following reasons. In one case the restaurant had recently been reorganised and could only produce figures for three months; we felt this was too short a period on which to base any conclusions, besides which this restaurant prepared special food and therefore could not really be considered representative. The four others were omitted because their financial returns were not sufficiently complete to give the information required. It so happened that these were the four smallest taking part in the enquiry, each having annual takings of less than £1,000; also, because of their particular circumstances, it was doubtful whether, in any case, these could be considered as normal communal restaurants.

Analysis of the Returns.

Of the thirty restaurants whose financial returns we finally analysed, twenty-three are run by committees formed solely for that purpose, whilst in other cases communal feeding is one activity only of the voluntary associations responsible for the restaurants.

The financial returns themselves were prepared by the managements of the restaurants concerned; sometimes this was done in conjunction with their own accountants, whilst in most cases the audited accounts formed the basis from which our questionnaires were completed. We ourselves did not and obviously could not verify in detail the figures submitted; at the same time any points that were not clear were followed up and so, in effect, quite a considerable amount of auditing was done by us. In all cases, except for Restaurant 28 in the attached statement, we received all the explanations or information we required and we feel therefore that the deductions which are drawn, rest at least on reliable premises. Regarding Restaurant 28, the adjusted figures are so strikingly different from all the other restaurants that we considered whether or not we should exclude it from our analysis. However, upon being assured that, owing to the liberal policy of giving cheap meals, the results were really as shown, we included it in the statement; but at the same time, in forming general conclusions, this can hardly be regarded as a typical restaurant.

Takings of the Restaurants.

Turning to the Analysis Statement which is at the end of this report, the restaurants have been arranged in order, on the basis of their annual takings, and have been numbered accordingly 1 to 30. The final column gives the results for all the restaurants taken together. The returns cover the last financial year of all the restaurants except five, where a full year's figures were not available. In these five instances the periods covered range from twenty-six to forty-seven weeks and the takings have been grossed up to give comparable annual figures. The takings for the year relate to the income from the sale of food only. Any miscellaneous receipts, such as, for example, donations or bank interest, have been omitted both from takings and in arriving at the profit or loss figures. The total takings for individual restaurants go from over a thousand to nearly twenty thousand pounds per annum; the aggregate for the thirty restaurants is £105,920, giving an average turnover of £3,530.

Meals Served.

The number of main meals, under which are included dinners served on a "cash-and-carry" basis, and the number of hot beverages shown for each restaurant in the Analysis Statement, are the average numbers served per week. In twenty-eight restaurants the main

meals refer to the mid-day dinners only, whilst in Restaurants 1 and 4, evening meals are also served and these account for approximately one-third of the main meals shown in the former case and one-half in the latter. In Restaurants 1 and 23, afternoon teas are also provided, but the numbers of these are comparatively small and are excluded from the figures shown for main meals. Hot beverages usually refer to teas only, although in some restaurants coffee is served as well, whilst in one case coffee only is available.

All the restaurants were open six days a week except four of the smaller ones which closed on Saturdays as well as on Sundays. Usually, the hours during which the public were admitted were from 12 noon to 2 p.m., although in several cases these were extended to, as much as, from 11.30 a.m. to 2.30 p.m. Restaurant 1 was open six days a week from 10 a.m. to 9 p.m.; Restaurant 4 closed at 2 p.m. and reopened for suppers on Mondays to Fridays from 6-7.30 p.m.; whilst Restaurant 23 also closed at 2 p.m. and reopened for teas, on five days a week, from 4.30 p.m.-7 p.m.

Generally speaking, the number of main meals provides a fairly reliable guide to the takings; but this is not always so. For example, Restaurant 16 served exactly the same number of main meals as Restaurant 9 and incidentally sold more hot beverages, and yet its takings are some £700 lower. In this particular instance, £200 of the difference is accounted for by the increased sweet charge, during some months of the year, in Restaurant 9, but the whole of the rest is due to the fact that one restaurant is in a very poor district, where the diners cannot afford extras such as soup and where for the same reason they will go for the cheaper rather than the dearer dishes. Another reason why the number of main meals does not vary in exact proportion to the takings, even after making allowance for variations in the prices charged, is that in some restaurants, more than others, diners have extras such as bread, soup or a second helping of sweet. What exactly is the reason for this, we do not know; it would seem to be determined not only by financial considerations but by habit and the custom in the particular restaurant. In one instance, for example, it is quite a common thing for diners to have a second sweet, as a matter of routine; but as only a few restaurants could supply us with the number of sweets or soups served, we have not been able to give comparative figures under these headings. Normally, however, it can be assumed that the main meal consists of one main dish and one sweet, with only a fairly small minority taking soup as well.

It is often stated that the profit on cups of tea is an important item in the economy of a restaurant. However true that may be in commercial restaurants, in civic ones where the charge is 1d. a cup it is not a very important factor. For example, Restaurants 12 and 13 serve about the same number of main meals per week, but the former averages 837 cups of tea weekly against the latter's 695. Even if it is assumed that the whole of the takings for teas is clear profit, this makes a difference of no more than £30 profit per annum.

Prices Charged.

The prices charged by each restaurant for the main items are shown in the Analysis Statement and it will be seen that, on the whole, there is little variation between the restaurants. Where a change in price has been made during the year reviewed, the prices before the change are given in brackets, whilst a dash indicates that a particular dish is not normally served.

Soup is on all the menus except two; the price normally is 2d., although Restaurant 4 charges 3d., Restaurant 28 1d. and Restaurants 2, 5, 9, 16, 22 and 27 1½d. The main dish is normally 8d. or 9d., whilst in thirteen restaurants there is a choice at two different prices. Most restaurants make a reduction in the price of the main dish for children, and over half serve old age pensioners at reduced prices. The charge for the sweet is 2d. in all cases except at Restaurants 4, 6 and 9 where it is 3d. Tea is served in all restaurants except one and the price per cup is always 1d., except at Restaurant 29 where it is 1½d. In addition to the two restaurants already mentioned, which provide afternoon teas, a few extras are available at certain restaurants. For example, eight serve coffee which generally is 2d. a cup, five serve cakes or pastries at 1d. or 2d., and seventeen restaurants sell bread at ½d. a slice.

Generally speaking, the price range varies from restaurant to restaurant, and bears no definite relationship to their size; for example, exactly the same prices are charged by Restaurant 30 as by Restaurant 1. Whilst the prices charged must necessarily be reflected in the takings, the degree of variation is relatively small; this may be seen by comparing the takings, the main meals served and the prices charged. The most obvious case of difference is between Restaurants 4 and 5; whereas the former serves some 400 fewer main meals per week and some 550 fewer hot beverages, yet, owing to somewhat higher prices, its takings are £260 higher than those of the latter.

The Cost Statement.

The cost statement shows the expenditure under headings, the total cost, and the final profit or loss. The figures are given in pence and decimals of pence, and are worked out per 1s. turnover. This presentation was felt to be the clearest for comparative purposes, and 1s. the most satisfactory unit to take, as it is the approximate cost of a meal in most of the restaurants. Bearing in mind the purpose of this enquiry, namely to ascertain whether such civic restaurants as these are likely to be practicable in times of peace, it was necessary, when working out the costs, to make allowance for all those services which the restaurants were receiving free or at reduced rates, as a result of present-day exigencies. Therefore, amounts were added, on bases which will be explained in detail later, to the actual financial expenditure incurred, in order

to represent the value of all such services. As a result, we arrived, in every case, at what was reckoned to be the true cost of running the restaurants as commercial propositions. The only item omitted, which one might possibly expect to see, was interest on capital, but as, in no case, had the premises for the restaurant been purchased, a reasonable charge for this was found to be negligible.

Food.

Taking the cost headings in order, the first is the cost of food. This for all the restaurants taken together worked out at 5.7d. per 1s. turnover, giving a gross profit of 6.3d. or 52½ per cent. This compares with the 50-60 per cent. which is reckoned to be the normal gross profit for commercially run restaurants. Apart from Restaurant 28, which we have previously mentioned, the cost of food varied from 4.6d. to 7.4d. per 1s. turnover, but in twenty-three restaurants the variation was only between 5.3d. and 6.2d. It is interesting to note that the cost of food does not vary proportionately with the size of the turnover; for example, in Restaurant 29, with a turnover of £1,191, the cost was cheaper than in Restaurant 1, with a turnover of £19,787. Nor apparently do the sources of supply appreciably affect the cost. Except for groceries which in eighteen cases were in whole or in part bought from wholesalers, nearly all restaurants purchased everything from local retailers. Only Restaurants 1 and 4 bought vegetables from Central London markets, though ten others bought theirs at local markets. We cannot, however, trace any connection between the cost of food and the source from which it is bought; in fact, in Restaurant 2 where the food at 4.6d. is cheapest of all, the whole of the buying is done locally at markets or through retailers.

The standard and variety of the food served to the public does, of course, vary to some extent from restaurant to restaurant, and if, for example, restaurants buying wholesale supplied better food, it might account for the fact that their food costs were as high as those buying at retailers. However, we do not think this is the whole story, even if it is true in part, for the meals do not vary very much, and certainly, in some cases where the food cost is low and the buying is done locally, the quality and choice of the dishes served is as high as anywhere. So, whilst we recognise the advantages of buying at central markets and from wholesalers, we must conclude that buying locally at retailers does not necessarily prejudice a restaurant.

Wages.

In arriving at the cost for Wages and National Insurance, provision has been made for the value of free help. The basis, which we suggested should be adopted in forming such an estimate, was to work out the additional cost, including national insurance, of such labour as would have been necessary if the voluntary help

had not been available. In seven restaurants only was there no voluntary help; in nine others it amounted to less than £100 per annum; whilst in the remainder it worked out at anything from £100 to £324 per annum. After allowing for this, the wages cost for the thirty restaurants amounted to 3·6*d.* per 1*s.* turnover and, excluding Restaurant 28, ranged from 2·7*d.* for Restaurant 17 to 5·3*d.* for Restaurant 26. As would be expected, the cost of wages, as of all other overheads except administration expenses, tended to vary directly with the turnover. For example, in none of the twelve largest restaurants did the wages cost reach 4*d.* per 1*s.* turnover; in the next nine it rose to 4·3*d.*; in the remaining nine it was never less than this figure.

Regarding the rates of wages, in all cases these appeared reasonable, and certainly, in these days of short labour, were competitive. We were able to compare the weekly rates of wages paid with the recommendations, for rates of pay for workers in civic restaurants in the County of London, as laid down by the Joint Industrial Council for Local Authorities' Non-Trading Services (Manual Workers). There was, however, one difficulty in making these comparisons; that was, to assess the amounts, deducted from wages, for meals taken by employees. Under the conditions of work laid down by the Joint Industrial Council, it merely states that meals, where supplied, shall be paid for by employees, without specifically saying at what prices; as nothing is said to the contrary, this presumably means that such meals shall be paid for at the full rates. In actual practice however, we found not only amongst those civic restaurants covered by our investigation but also in outside cases, that this interpretation was not necessarily adopted, and the rates of deduction for meals varied appreciably. In some cases, the meals taken by employees were charged for in full when the weekly wages were worked out; in others only a nominal charge was made, in which case it usually was based on the estimated cost of the meals. The latter seemed to be the procedure most generally followed, and therefore we adopted this basis, when making our comparisons.

We found that the general policy of the restaurants, covered by our enquiry, was to adopt Joint Industrial Council rates. In fourteen cases these were already in force; in eight others they were being introduced; in the remaining eight the rates paid appeared slightly below those recommended by the Joint Industrial Council, though in four of these cases increases in pay were shortly to be introduced. During the financial periods covered by the investigation, the increased rates of pay were not in force in all the restaurants; if, however, they had been, the additional cost to the wages bill would have been comparatively small. Judging by test selections, and bearing in mind the liberal interpretation which we have followed regarding the deductions for meals, the additional cost per annum for a restaurant not paying Joint Industrial Council rates would have amounted to about ·3*d.* per 1*s.*

turnover, so that an additional charge of $\frac{1}{2}d.$ per main dish or sweet would have considerably more than covered this.

As for the conditions of work, these seem particularly attractive to the type of worker employed. A large majority of these workers are married women, and, except for the senior staff, the hours worked in most restaurants range from eighteen to thirty-six per week. These hours give the women more time to shop and run their homes than would be the case if they were working the normal working week. Also, the provision of a good mid-day meal seems generally appreciated by them.

Rent, Fuel and Repairs.

Rent, Rates and Insurance amounted to $\cdot 6d.$ per $1s.$ turnover for all the restaurants taken together and varied from $\cdot 3d.$ to $1 \cdot 1d.$ In many instances, the building used by a restaurant is rent free at the present time; in these cases, as well as in those where the rent or rates were sympathetically assessed, additional amounts were estimated and included in the cost.

Generally speaking, the cost of Fuel, Lighting and Cleaning was approximately the same as for Rent, Rates and Insurance. For the thirty restaurants it worked out at exactly the same figure, namely at $\cdot 6d.$ per $1s.$ turnover, though the range of variation was somewhat narrower. Under this heading there was little adjusting to do, as in only two cases were any of these services not paid for in full.

The cost of Repairs and Redecoration to Premises varied from $\cdot 1d.$ to $\cdot 4d.$, with a total for all the restaurants of $\cdot 2d.$ per $1s.$ turnover. In every case, we tried to arrive at an average annual cost for repairs and redecoration. In a few instances, where repairs had been exceptionally heavy, this meant spreading the charge over two years, but in the large majority it meant increasing the provision made. As elsewhere, care was taken to see that the cost was not under-estimated, and it is probable that, in many instances, the average annual expenditure would not work out to the figures included in the cost statement. Nothing has been included for any final dilapidations, as in most cases, if not in all, the premises are in a far better state than they were when taken over, and any possible claim for dilapidations would be more than offset by a counterclaim for improvements carried out.

Depreciation.

As might be expected, it was not easy to arrive at a true cost for depreciation. The basis eventually adopted was to write off Structural Alterations and Cooking Apparatus over eight and one-third years, to write off Furniture and Fittings over five years, and to write off Crockery, Cutlery and Linen over two years. This

compares with the present basis recommended by the Ministry of Food of writing everything off over eight and one-third years, and of charging replacements of light equipment to revenue. It will thus be seen that the annual charge, on the basis we adopted, is somewhat heavier than the Ministry of Food basis and the rates adopted are certainly heavier than those allowed by the Inland Revenue for Income Tax purposes. In those restaurants where cooking apparatus was hired, the cost of hire was included under the heading of Depreciation rather than under Fuel, so as to give figures more nearly comparable.

For certain restaurants, either because they had taken over cooking apparatus that had already been installed or else because the records did not sufficiently clearly identify the types of capital equipment, estimates had to be made. In arriving at these figures, consideration was given to such information as was available and also to the annual charge for similar restaurants; here again, the estimates were generously made and the tendency was to make too much rather than too little provision. For the thirty restaurants the depreciation charge on the above basis worked out at $\cdot 5d.$ per $1s.$ turnover, with a variation of $\cdot 3d.$ to $\cdot 7d.$

Central Administration.

The last item of expenditure represents administration expenses; this covers such items as managerial and office salaries, printing, stationery, postages, audit fees and similar charges. The cost for all the restaurants is $\cdot 4d.$ per $1s.$ turnover and goes from nothing to $\cdot 7d.$ Here the general trend of overheads is reversed and, broadly speaking, the high figures relate to the restaurants with the bigger turnovers. The reason for this is that the cost of administration charges is largely determined by whether or not the restaurant is one of a group for which there is a central administrative office. Twenty-two of the restaurants belong to one or other of four groups which have central administrative offices; on the other hand, Restaurants 4, 13, 15, 23, 24, 25, 28 and 29, although not all working as single units, have no central administration, and in none of these does the cost of the administrative expenses exceed $\cdot 3d.$ per $1s.$ turnover. At the same time, these cases are not strictly comparable, as it was not possible to apportion salaries so as to cover those functions which would normally be done by a central office. If effect had been given to the above, it would, of course, tend to increase administration expenses and decrease wages and national insurance; and this should be borne in mind when making the comparisons. The basis adopted for allocating central administrative charges over a group of restaurants was usually that of the turnover, and, apart from the above instances, these amounted to $\cdot 7d.$ per $1s.$ turnover at Restaurants 1 and 3, to $\cdot 6d.$ in five other instances and from $\cdot 2d.$ to $\cdot 5d.$ for the remainder.

We feel the results shown give no conclusive proof as to what financial benefits, if any, are brought by the central administration of restaurants. However, in considering this problem, the emphasis should be on the efficiency, rather than on the degree, of central administration, and this is a matter which obviously must be determined by other than purely financial standards. All that can be said is that we can see nothing, in our financial analysis, which might offset the advantages generally claimed for centrally administering restaurants in groups rather than running them as individual units.

Final Conclusions.

As shown by the statement, the total expenditure for all the restaurants taken together amounted to 11·6d. per 1s. turnover, giving a profit of ·4d. The profit figure is the difference between the total cost and 1s., whilst where the total cost exceeds 1s., then there is a loss. Of the thirty restaurants, fifteen show profits, one ends all square and fourteen show losses. The profits vary from ·1d. to 2·0d. per 1s. turnover and in six cases are 1·0d. or more; the losses, apart from Restaurant 28, also cover approximately the same range. In the case of those restaurants showing losses, we have worked out the percentage increase in prices required to counterbalance these, and we have also translated the percentages into terms of increases in charges. At nine restaurants the losses can be considered slight and an increased charge of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. or less per main dish would have more than covered the deficit; the other restaurants would have required to increase the price of their main dish by up to 2d. to cover themselves.

Comparing the net results with the turnovers, we get the most interesting comparisons. Without exception, the restaurants with a turnover of over £3,000 per annum showed a profit, those whose takings were between £2,000 and £3,000 made either a small profit or a small loss, and, also without exception, those with a turnover below £2,000 made a loss. However, when considering the above results, it must be remembered that the expenditure shown is arrived at after making allowance for the value of *all* services which were given free or at reduced rates. In actual fact, the financial results of the restaurants were naturally appreciably better than we have shown. For example, before we made any adjustments to their accounts only eight out of the thirty restaurants showed a deficit and in every case except in one, where the whole of the initial capital expenditure had been written off, the loss was almost negligible. Obviously, a restaurant, such as any of those included in our enquiry, would not continue running at a deficit unless it was subsidised by its parent body or unless it was associated in a group with others whose profits counterbalanced its own loss, and normally, if a loss were anticipated, this would be forestalled by an increase in charges.

A further comparison, which was made, was to trace, as far as possible, the relationship between the amenities of the various restaurants and their financial results. Generally speaking, however, nothing striking was shown here, and so far as the dining rooms themselves, the seating accommodation, the layout of the kitchens, and the kitchen equipment went, the conditions varied independently of the financial status of the restaurants. In other words, those restaurants which were financially successful did not obtain their results at the expense of curtailing the comfort of either the diners or the staff.

On the other hand, one factor, which at first sight seemed to have some connection with the financial results of the restaurants, was their situation. Of the fifteen restaurants making profits, four were situated in predominantly commercial areas, six in residential areas which might be described as middle class, and five were in working-class residential districts. Turning to the fifteen restaurants which did not show profits, again four were in commercial areas, but two only were in middle-class and as many as nine in working-class residential districts. Although we had found that the primary factor governing profits was the turnover, we felt that, in working-class districts, the turnover was, perhaps, limited by the accommodation available; so we carried the analysis a stage further and compared the seating accommodation of all the restaurants. We found that, by and large, restaurants in working-class residential areas did not suffer more than others from lack of room and that they were able to take just as many diners as the others. We can, therefore, eliminate the question of the physical capacity of these restaurants when comparing the results; which means that the general conditions deciding whether restaurants are likely to prove financially successful or not, also govern those restaurants which are situated in working-class residential districts.

Summing up the position, it would seem that, from the figures shown by our investigation, the one determining factor, as to whether a restaurant pays or not, is the turnover. Among our restaurants at any rate, such considerations as whether they are centrally administered or not, where the provisions are purchased, how the restaurants are laid out and so on, would seem in this connection to be almost irrelevant.

Future Prospects.

As for the part finance will play in determining the future of the civic restaurants covered by our enquiry and others like them, we feel that the figures shown provide as reliable a guide as it is possible to give at this juncture. There are, however, a few general points that should be borne in mind when considering this question. Firstly, it seems unlikely that the restaurants will be able to count on free help or services after the war; although, as far as the figures in this report go, allowance has already been made for this factor.

Secondly, in the case of several restaurants the wages bill is likely to be somewhat heavier in future than it was in the year under review, but, as previously stated, at the worst this is not expected to amount to as much as $\frac{1}{2}d.$ per main meal, even if the increased charge were wholly passed on to prices. Thirdly, the returns of many restaurants included in our investigation related to their first financial year and it is to be expected that the next year's results will be better, not only because of non-recurring expenses, but because of the experience gained in running the restaurants. In fact, this applies to all the restaurants and almost certainly, after a few years, this should be reflected in the financial results to quite an appreciable extent. Fourthly and lastly, after the war the public will probably demand more choice and possibly more elaborate dishes; how much this can be given without increasing prices, must remain a matter of conjecture, but without doubt the present system of rationing does tend to reduce food costs. Also, as the national emergency passes, the public will probably tend to demand further refinements in the civic restaurants: tablecloths, smaller tables, more space, less waiting, and so on. How much all these will cost financially, one cannot tell; perhaps, however, it may justifiably be assumed that the reduction in costs, to be expected as a result of the experience gained in running civic restaurants, will be sufficient to cover the increase in costs that the withdrawal of rationing and the increase in amenities may entail.

After the war, there will without doubt be many problems, both anticipated and unforeseen, facing civic restaurants, but even when the above qualifications have been taken into account, we feel that the results of this enquiry have shown that, except perhaps in the cases of the smallest restaurants, the problem of finance is not likely to be one of them.

ANALYSIS STATEMENT FOR 30 CIVIC RESTAURANTS.

1. Restaurants	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	
2. Takings for Year	£19,787	£7,049	£6,096	£5,492	£5,232	£3,990	£3,970	£3,815	£3,492	£3,284	£3,253	£2,956	£2,908	£2,907	£2,796	
3. Meals served per Week :—																
Main meals	10,467	3,125	2,586	2,022	2,404	1,886	2,006	1,916	1,635	1,241	1,572	1,490	1,496	1,546	1,468	
Hot beverages	5,374	1,346	1,047	260	817	1,323	777	605	721	699	547	837	695	533	641	
4. Prices Charged :—																
Soup	2d.	1½d.	2d.	3d.	1½d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	1½d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	
Main dish	9d.	6d. 8d. 10d.	9d.	6d. 10d. 1s.	6d. 8d. 10d.	(6d.) 8d. 10d.	(6d.) 8d.	(6d.) 8d.	6d. 8d.	9d.	(6d.) 8d.	(6d.) 8d.	8d.	(6d.) 8d.	8d.	
Sweet	2d.	2d.	2d.	3d.	2d.	(2d.) 3d.	2d.	2d.	(2d.) 3d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	
Tea	1d.	1d.	1d.	—	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	
5. Cost Statement :—																
Expenditure per 1s. turnover :—	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	
Food	5.6	4.6	6.0	6.1	5.4	7.4	5.7	5.7	5.0	5.7	5.3	6.2	6.2	6.2	5.8	
Wages and National Insurance	3.1	3.2	2.9	3.5	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.7	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.2	
Rent, Rates and Insurance	.4	.5	.3	.3	.3	.3	1.0	1.1	.3	.5	.6	.7	.7	.4	.6	
Fuel, Lighting and Cleaning	.5	.5	.6	.7	.4	.4	.5	.6	.6	.9	.6	.7	.9	.5	.8	
Repairs and Redecoration of Premises... ..	.3	.3	.2	.2	.2	.1	.1	.1	.3	.2	.1	.3	.1	.2	.2	
Depreciation	.4	.3	.3	.4	.3	.3	.5	.5	.4	.3	.4	.6	.4	.6	.6	
Administration Expenses	.7	.6	.7	.1	.6	.2	.2	.2	.6	.6	.2	.2	.1	.3	.1	
Total Cost	11.0	10.0	11.0	11.3	10.3	11.9	11.2	11.9	10.8	11.4	10.4	12.5	12.4	12.0	12.3	
Profit (+) or loss (—) per 1s. turnover ...	+ 1.0	+ 2.0	+ 1.0	+ .7	+ 1.7	+ .1	+ .8	+ .1	+ 1.2	+ .6	+ 1.6	— .5	— .4	—	— .3	
6. Percentage Increase in Prices Required to counterbalance above Loss ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4%	4%	—	3%	
7. Equivalent in Terms of Additional Charge for the Main Dish	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	½d.	½d.	—	½d.	
Total for the 30 restaurants																
1. Restaurants (continued)	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.	21.	22.	23.	24.	25.	26.	27.	28.	29.	30.	
2. Takings for Year	£2,771	£2,728	£2,677	£2,586	£2,422	£2,219	£1,898	£1,853	£1,766	£1,469	£1,406	£1,385	£1,367	£1,191	£1,155	£105,920
3. Meals served per Week :—																
Main meals	1,635	1,250	1,422	1,230	1,310	1,141	1,154	914	1,318	805	855	673	1,269	502	622	52,960
Hot beverages	962	1,046	308	676	404	426	288	499	304	342	281	385	400	429	381	23,353
4. Prices Charged :—																
Soup	1½d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	1½d.	—	(1d.) 2d.	—	2d.	1½d.	1d.	2d.	2d.	—
Main dish	6d. 8d. 10d.	9d.	8d.	(8d.) 9d. 10d.	(6d.) 8d.	(6d.) 8d.	6d. 8d.	8d.	6d. 8d.	(7d.) 8d.	8d. 10d.	6d. 8d.	6d. 8d.	8½d. 9½d.	9d.	—
Sweet	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	2d.	—
Tea	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1d.	1½d.	1d.	—
5. Cost Statement :—																
Expenditure per 1s. turnover :—	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.
Food	5.4	6.6	5.8	6.1	6.0	5.3	4.9	5.6	5.9	5.6	6.0	5.0	8.2	5.5	6.8	5.7
Wages and National Insurance	4.3	2.7	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.4	5.3	4.3	5.6	4.7	4.6	3.6
Rent, Rates and Insurance	.6	.6	.6	.4	.8	.8	1.0	1.0	.9	.7	.6	.7	1.0	.7	.8	.6
Fuel, Lighting and Cleaning	.6	.6	.7	.7	.5	.6	.8	.9	1.0	1.0	.9	.7	.8	1.2	.7	.6
Repairs and Redecoration of Premises... ..	.3	.2	.1	.2	.1	.1	.3	.2	.1	.2	.3	.4	.2	.2	.4	.2
Depreciation	.4	.4	.6	.4	.5	.5	.8	.5	.4	.4	.4	.7	.6	.4	.5	.5
Administration Expenses	.5	.6	.3	.2	.3	.3	.3	.3	.0	.1	.3	.5	.3	.2	.4	.4
Total Cost	12.1	11.7	11.9	11.9	12.1	11.7	12.5	13.3	12.9	12.4	13.8	12.3	16.7	12.9	14.2	11.6
Profit (+) or loss (—) per 1s. turnover ...	— .1	+ .3	+ .1	+ .1	— .1	+ .3	— .5	— 1.3	— .9	— .4	— 1.8	— .3	— 4.7	— .9	— 2.2	+ .4
6. Percentage Increase in Prices Required to counterbalance above Loss ...	1%	—	—	—	1%	—	5%	11%	8%	3%	15%	3%	39%	8%	18%	—
7. Equivalent in Terms of Additional Charge for the Main Dish	½d.	—	—	—	½d.	—	½d.	1½d.	½d.	½d.	1½d.	½d.	2d.	1d.	1½d.	—

